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"For aloneness in thine eyes, O Liberty:
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou say not, we will trust in thee."

On Picket Duty.

Hugh Prior Hughes says that "Sanctification is an intense desire: not to have your own way." If this definition is correct, it is very easy to understand why no one has been able to find a genuine sanctitariation. Common sense from judges on the subject of boycotting, blackmailing, and extortion is so rare that I am glad to note the decision recently rendered by the New York Supreme Court, in which the position was taken that it is unlawful for a delegate of workmen to demand money from an employer and threaten him that, if the money was not paid, the workmen in his employ would stop work. The judges held that it was unlawful for the workmen to leave or for the $" to advise them to leave.

The "$" does not like the abuse laws of New York, and thinks that "it is only right that it should be an expensive luxury to enforce a summary law that makes a crime of conduct not criminal in itself, and that makes criminals of honest people." Does the "$" forget that most of our statutes make crimes of conduct not criminal in itself? The enforcement of all these statutes is an expensive luxury. To enjoy this luxury, people go without bread. Yet the "$," which pretends to admire simplicity, economy, and moderation, neglects to remonstrate with the reckless citizens and to teach them the beauty of economy and legislation.

Speaking of the people who denounce every utterance in which an assumption of the eternal validity of the recognized virtues is not implicit, Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, in his "Quaintness of Believing," says that "all progress involves the beating of them from that position." Mr. Shaw is of course right, and it is easy to cite a thousand convincing illustrations of the truth of this proposition. But Mr. Shaw, very unfortunately, "takes up" the case of Proudhon, who, nearly a century ago denounced "property" as theft. Mr. Shaw does not take the trouble of reproducing Proudhon's definitions and definitions, and no reader will easily find in his words a confirmation of the notion that Proudhon was a Communist and really opposed private property.

Because the "Popular Science Monthly" has printed an article on "Eight Hours" which contains some platitudes and not a little nonsense, the "Journal of the Knights of Labor" says that the former magazine, while it may be an authority on archeology, evidently know very little of sociology. Magazine editors are not responsible for opinions advanced by contributors; but the absurdity of the "Journal's" remark is greater than may be inferred from this simple fact. It is well known that the editor of the "Popular Science Monthly" is a devotee of Spencer, and that his sociology is the same as Spencer's. Is our Knight of Labor prepared to labor with Spencer and enlighten him on sociological matters?

The New York "Times" refers contemptuously to the "cranks" who "talk rubbish about 'making the volume of currency equal to the wants of trade,'" and denies that there is any evidence that a single commercial transaction has failed to be consummated in this country for the last twenty years for want of the currency with which to make the exchange. No commercial transactions do not fail to be consummated, but business men are driven out of business and into bankruptcy, while many are kept out of business, by the ruinous rate of interest which is the result of the monopoly of the currency. Lately I quoted in these columns an editorial paragraph from the "Times," in which the fact was commented to the attention of the "money cranks" that by a simple arrangement between the banks $41d did the work of $1,000. Would we be as well off if the Clearing House institution were abolished? If not, the evidence has the "Times" that this institution leaves no want unsatisfied. We do not expect the "Times" to favor the abolition of the money monopoly, but we expect it to try to be consistent. The enthusiasm over the "transatlantic wreck" of the Clearing Houses, and the contempt for the "money cranks," do not admit of being explained by the same theory.

What is the matter with the Nationalists? They seem to be trying to prejudice the public against socialism and to be determined to make out a difference between the two movements at the expense of truth. In a recent issue I referred to a paragraph in the "New Nation" bearing on this subject, and now I read in a report of a lecture on "Socialism and Nationalism" delivered the other day by Asaon A. Hamer, managing editor of the "New Nation," that "the picture went into the phases of the two organizations and their fundamental differences,—the one claiming for a complete substitution of public control and ownership for private and competitive enterprises; the other hoping for similar results, but by slower and more lasting methods, sharing in burdens and profits, and making for a pure economic democracy." As the report appeared in a paper friendly to nationalism, there is no reason to doubt its accuracy. Now, even admitting the allegation as to difference in methods, such difference cannot be called "fundamental." But no such difference exists, and the Nationalists know it. The German Socialists have just adopted a new platform, and so "slow" are their methods that the whole world of capital is gratified at their moderation, while the Socialists of this country, almost without exception, believe in political methods. Again I ask: What is the matter with the Nationalists?

In an article on "Prohibition and Labor" contributed by a prohibitionist to the "Arena," I find the following paragraph, which may be here reproduced without comment: "In the cabinet of the first president of the republic, Thomas Jefferson was Secretary of State, and Alexander Hamilton was Secretary of the Treasury. To each of them Washington submittted the question whether Congress had power to incorporate a bank. Jefferson, believing popular liberty safe only in a strict construction of the constitution, denied the power to create a bank, because no such power is expressed, or is strictly necessary to the exercise of any power expressly granted. Hamilton, believing that a liberal construction of the constitution was essential to the development of America, answered that Congress had the power, that the power was incidental to the national character of the government. He construed the grant of 'necessary and proper' powers in these words: 'It is a common mode of expression to say that it was necessary for a government or person to do this or that thing, when nothing more is intended or understood than that interests of the person acquire or may be promoted by doing this or that thing. The imagination can be at no loss for exemplifications on the use of the word in this sense. And it is the true one, in which it is to be understood as used in the constitution.' The Supreme Court quoting these words with approval, has adopted Hamilton's construction."

I have never said that Mr. Petticoat's ideal of society, in which there shall be no armies or prisons, is the sheerest moonshine and Utopia. As I have never said so, it is difficult for me to understand how Mr. Petticoat can declare, as he does in the "Twentieth Century," that I think so, except on the supposition that there are times when Mr. Petticoat is incapable of reading the English language. What I have said is this: "So long as Mr. Petticoat is willing to let the criminal ride roughshod over him and refrain from being ruled at all, is nothing but a beastly revelling in sheerest moonshine and iuopia." Now it is obvious that these words do not characterize Utopian the mere "preference not to be ruled at all" in the sense of a wish that there were no criminals or in the person desiring trying to rule. So far from deeming it Utopian to dream of such a condition, I think that progress has been and is, in the long run, toward such a condition, and I have repeatedly said so in these columns. What I characterized as moonshining, which is of the "preference not to be ruled at all" in the sense of non-resistance to criminal rule put forward as a maximum of present political conduct while criminals still exist. This is the sense in which Mr. Petticoat must have used the phrase, because he directed it to criminals and containing nothing to warrant the implication now put upon my words that I desire the continued existence of criminals. The fact is that my answer to Mr. Petticoat has made it impossible for him to defend his attitude of non-resistance to criminals. If the regulation policy, with its coolly assumes that he took no such position, but merely intended to express a wish that the time may come when criminals shall be no more. The trick is scarcely in keeping with the canard which Mr. Petticoat at times exhibits. I am loath to relinquish my hope that this virtue is less spasmodic than his opinions.

How Government-Restriction Works.

[Today]

We have it on the authority of a press dispatch that the Kansas Superintendent of Insurance has announced that he will either compel insurance companies doing business in Kansas to appoint agents in that State or else refuse them licenses. In other words, the superintendent feels called upon to announce that he will hereafter enforce the law! This is a very pretty commentary on the way State superintendents work. If the regulation clause with the interests of the rich and industrially powerful, the officers charged with the execution of the law are always announcing that they are just about to begin. They remit one of the exploiters of Mr. Winkle and Mr. Sandys. Like the latter, "in a truly Christian spirit, and in order that they may take no unwise, they are now in a very hurry to do what they are going to begin, and proceed at once to take off their coats with the utmost deliberation," and, like the former, they forthwith make a terrible onslaught on a small boy. The established companies are safe enough; but just a small concern show its head in Kansas without a license, and see how quick the superintendent will fall on it teeth and nails. Is it so very wonderful, after all, that companies already successfully engaged welcome governmental regulation?
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"In avoiding rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the revolution advances at every step the scourge of the commoner, the want of the magnates, the club of the plutocrats, the power of the oligarchy: the only requisites of all those insinuations of Politics, which young Liberty professed to barter her teeth." — PROGRESS.

The appearance in the editorial columns of articles on other subjects that is the editor's intention to indicate that the editor's attentions are on the page of the paper, and that he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. The appearance in the editorial columns of the gazetteer, by the very nature of the case, is not made responsible.

A NEW BOOK GIVEN AWAY WITH EACH PURCHASE.

Payment of subscription price or renewal price entitles you to a copy of this book. The book is a handsome one that may be relied on for its value, and it is selected to meet the readers' taste. It is a permanent gift, and it is a book to be treasured by all who love good reading. It is a book to be read and re-read, and it will give you a good deal of pleasure.

The Lesson of Reformers’ Failures.

"The complete failure of the Farmers’ Alliance movement, after flourishing and spreading alarms for less than a year, is the result of a failure to understand the conditions of success of which I have spoken. It is because the party wants to cut a figure in politics immediately after its birth that the fatal course above described is taken. On the disadvantages of the political method itself I need not exhaust. With the union of the party, the jealousy, selfishness, and treachery of politicians we are all familiar. Labor politicians have not given us any reasons for remembering them as exceptions to the rule.

Why are reform movements short-lived?" — THE AMERICAN STATESMAN.

A brief examination of the appearance and progress of these crises during the past twenty years shows very clearly that the movement in 1883, within a very brief period. There is probably no society in the world on which it is harder to make a quick impression of any sort in favor of a very radical change in the social and political order. The phrase of the people is: "We have been working at it for nearly two years to build up a party, and it lasts about the same length of time to drive a party defi-

ently out of power. All originators and promoters of crises usually fail in the end, and if they are not acted upon and moved, before a new and able foes, there is no hope of success.

The lesson to be learned from the failure of the Farmers’ Alliance is that the movement is a failure, not because of its shortness of time, but because of its failure to understand the conditions of success.

The failure of the Farmers’ Alliance is a lesson to be remembered, and the lesson is, "Why are reform movements short-lived?" — THE STATESMAN.

A brief examination of the appearance and progress of these crises during the past twenty years shows very clearly that the movement is a failure, not because of its shortness of time, but because of its failure to understand the conditions of success.

The lesson to be learned from the failure of the Farmers’ Alliance is that the movement is a failure, not because of its shortness of time, but because of its failure to understand the conditions of success.

The lesson to be learned from the failure of the Farmers’ Alliance is that the movement is a failure, not because of its shortness of time, but because of its failure to understand the conditions of success.
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sees the organs of Russian opinion." Will Mr. Pix-
ley kindly inform us how much the statements of the
Russian press would be worth, either to our metropo-
litan papers or to any other r journal? A press which
is only by the sufferance of government officials
and prints only what those officials approve must in-
deed be a source of reliable information concerning
the atrocities of a half-barbarian government. But
perhaps Mr. Pixley is prepared to discredit the state-
ments of George Wood, Scipio N. C. Covert, and other
intelligent Americans and Russians relative to the
position of the press in Russia. Perhaps he is pre-
pared to assert that the editor in Russia wields as un-
trammeled a pen as does the English or the American
director. Perhaps he will point out that there has exis-
ted in the United States or out of it a power able
and willing to seize by the neck and heels and
pitch into the Pacific every maimer and murderer of
inoffensive Chinese on the Coast. If criminal Cali-
ifornians have to suffer the law and the penalties
of a pirate or a bandit in preference to those of
the victims of either, especially if a few sensible and jus-
tice-loving Englishmen should be so indiscreet as
to expose the cause of the despised and wounded un-
fortunates. But to allow the government of the
States and England are not dwarfs, and it is perfectly
legitimate for their people and governments to say
and do whatever seems to them calculated to mitigate
the horrors of the Clarendon. It is merely a ques-
tion of opinion, and that is as true of the Chinese
as of the English. Mr. Pixley makes himself an object of ridicule in the eyes of
common-sense people when he indulges in this baf-
dash about meddling with the Czar in the government
of "his empire." The editor of the "Argonaut"
will do as well as both that the San Francisco ruffian
has an absolute right to mob and murder his own
family; that his management of its "internal affairs"
is no concern of outsiders; that he may issue such
"edita" as he chooses, and if he finds it conducive to
his pleasure to whip his child to death or imprison
his wife for a dark and filthy cellar the neighbors
have no business to "meddle" with his amusements.
The child is his, the wife is his, and it is a much
more intimate and per

cial sense than the Russian people are the Czar's
"subjects." And has Mr. Pixley truly and perfectly
us that the St. Petersburg ruffian, the Great White
Father, may do as he likes with "his empire"? Why,
then, may not the San Francisco ruffian do as he wills
with "his family"? Is he not its Father and Head?
Mr. Pixley doubles the stigma and the scandal on
his name by mentioning concerns concerning Russian tyrannies and says that "it is hard
to reconcile them with the general loyalty of the
Russian people to their government." Certainly
the literati, heart, and hope of the Russian people, the ed-
cuated classes (exclusive of a part only of officialdom),
are thoroughly Russian and fervently, even sweetly,
subservient a majority of them are forced to be
in speech and act. But what about the great bulk of
the people, the peasantry? Are they not generally
concealed and superstitions to a degree? As the "long-ago" Russian speaks, there is the "long-ago"
Russian peasantry." It is their ignorance and supersti-
tion that is the support of the Cossacks, and one of
the most unoffending offences of the students and
the nihilists is the attempt to introduce among
these people the teachings of some of the noblest prin-
ples of so-called free government, moving the govern-
ment of universal suffrage.

E. C. WALKER.

Plumb-Line Pointers.

I am not a reformer. This I have again and again said
in these columns. I am not trying to reform anybody or any-
thing. To do so would be no more impossible, useless, and absurd
than it would be for me to influence my shoe to wear shoes. It is my highest desire that people should live as they please.
I merely express certain opinions because it is a pleasure to do so. If those opinions are of use to one or two I am glad, but I am not trying to influence any one by them. I dislike
reformers, and seriously object to being called or supposed to
be one. Reformers are a bore, a nuisance.—Hugh O. Pen-
tecost.

I express certain opinions not only because it is a pleasure to do so, but because I am trying to reform several persons and several things. I may not suc-
cess to any extent in my endeavors, but I think that
if I could do so my surroundings would be much more agreeable to me. This would increase my happiness both directly and indirectly by giving me better rewards for my labor, associations less limited
and directed by others, and the placidity of mind
which plenty and liberty bring in their train. Indi-
rectly, by affording me the mental and emotional
enjoyment which I find in a name, free, and painless actions of my fellows. Therefore I am a reformer and an studying modes of expression and principles of action that I may exert all the influence
possible by my utterances and acts. I do not deem
this either impertinent, useless, or absurd. With the
element of invasive force eliminated, I see nothing
to dislike in any reformers, as reformers. I wish to
remark, further, that in my opinion there would be no
Hugh O. Pontecost (I speak of the mental, not of the
physical man) and no "Twentieth Century" for him
if it had been there no reformers in the world.

The first paragraph below is from the "Credit Fon-
cier" of Sinaloa; the second is a declaration by A. K.
Owen, originator of the Topolobampo enterprise:

We believe in the doctrine that God is love; in forgiveness of
injuries; in good deeds; in fraternal love and kindness to all;
but we make no special professions, and by our funda-
mental laws can never have any temples raised to any par-
ticular religion or to any other system. We are bound to
allow everyone to interpret all inspirational or
religious books for himself and to cherish whatever conceptions
the soul may form respecting the reli-
gious aspirations of all, but firmly maintain that religion is a
matter between God and one's own soul: that if one man
does not like what another man believes or acts he no
right to make it a matter of public controversy.
We trust the great majority will understand our
principles. That will be satisfactorily to all.

Pacific City is the first community ever presented with
fixed rules to guarantee religious liberty and at the
same time encourage and protect the one man or the one
woman who wished to give expression of his or her certain views, or
to practice his or her peculiar rites.

There seem to be several authoritative mines in the
Sinaloa lead rock. What becomes of the expressions of
religious toleration in the face of the express stipula-
tions in our fundamental laws shall be no
Churches erected or paid preachers permitted in the
colony? What about the practice of the "peculiar
rites" of the individual? Suppose these include wor-
ship in a church building? Who will give a de-
finite answer?

The eating and drinking of our day in State as in Church is for
men who will call no man master; who will follow their
leader only when their leader goes right; who will carry a
conscience wrapped up in their ballot to the polling
place; who will vote with an eye upturned to God.—Heber Ne-
son.

But it is to be noted that men who have "an eye
upturned to God" are the very ones who are most
prone to call some other man "master." In other
words, he who worships God is an enthroned man, and hence becomes easily the dupe and
tool of men serving at his own pleasure. And of all voters who are undesirable and dangerous is
this man whom Heber Newton sights for, the godly
man who carries a conscience wrapped up in his
ballot. The religious conscience has in all ages been
above the "better" principles. It is now sometimes called the "moral" conscience, but the
change of name has not altered its character.

E. C. WALKER.

ON A CERTAIN WOULD-BE HUMORIST.

There was a man named Leopoldine,
Who made an attempt at a farce,
A laugh couldn't cost;
He wrote himself down as an.
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